

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
AIKEN DIVISION

Jesse Edmond,	)	Civil Action No.: 1:14-cv-446-RBH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
William R. Byars, Jr.; Joseph	)	
McFadden; Nurse Dehart; Nurse	)	
Mauney; D. Jarjeren; E. Holcomb;	)	
Unknown Healthcare Service	)	
Provider; and South Carolina	)	
Department of Corrections, each in	)	
his/her individual and personal	)	
capacity,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff Jesse Edmond (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, originally filed this action in the Court of Common Pleas for Dorchester County, South Carolina. *See* Complaint, ECF No. 1-1. Defendants removed the action to this Court on February 20, 2014, *see* ECF No. 1, and Plaintiff filed a motion to remand on March 13, 2014, *see* ECF No. 14. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. *See* R & R, ECF No. 35. In the R & R, the Magistrate Judge recommends the Court grant Plaintiff’s motion, and remand the matter to the Court of Common Pleas for Dorchester County, South Carolina. *See id.* at 5.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a

*de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion to remand is **GRANTED**. This matter is **REMANDED** to the Court of Common Pleas for Dorchester County, South Carolina.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
October 3, 2014